

Walnut Grove 4/10/96 - Public Scoping Meeting

Q. Why did you leave out the corps - environ review , levee and other , why aren't we talking to them?

Q. Why aren't they participating in the regional flood control?

Q. Rep dist 556, 98% of all levees are owned by the districts - day to day long and short flood protections, how come the local reclamation districts involved and why haven't they been asked to the party?

- that is the problem - you guys get paid if the problem is solved or not, no one consulted us, and we are most intimately involved with the problem and if it fails or not.

Q. When you're discussing the levees outside of the people that are not participating and send them the information to the people and let them have the info and let them know what is going on.

Q - have you what % of total flow this cubic feet per second will be? Is this the p-canal or an isolated bypass., what will be taken out of the river.

Q-This is the highest cfs to date, do you have the numbers  
a-generally 15-20% into isolated facility during high flow areas, similar to historical peripheral canal, but has fish screen. During low-flow, we are unable to say.

Q - Is this the facility that doesn't have any releases into the delta?

Not be making any release into delta due to concerns, 100cfs refers to winter and spring flow  
There is opportunity to exchange water with different water districts, 100,000cfs

Q- didn't the voters reject this issue earlier (1982)?

This is similar, but not the same

Matrix

Q. Consider , over 22 yrs, deceased assemblywomen, Pauline Davis, that the system had already extracted the water and sold it to Central and So calif, and second the only way the sta and feds have gotten by , is that they wtr users - had no idea how the state was going to pay for it

3. The only net increase in employment (according to Sac Bee) has been in agric. And all your alt are affecting agriculture, some of the best agri in the state

4. Atl b, probably most effective in addressing, what hasn't been spoken publicly in the creation of additional wtr storage facilities to meet the environmental, agri, and urban needs. Storage no and so of alts, because in all the other alts the storage facilities so of the delta are inefficient.

Why many of proposed alts aren't going to work and why the "p" canal - why nobody will say how much water has to come out of the Sacramento River during the spring and summer, because on the "p" canal or any of the other alts speaking to that the south delta water storage facilities are inadequate to store sufficient water to supply the contract commitments. 10 yrs ago after the 1986 flood, and we met with dwr public hearings and had enviro studies to dig out no. fork of Mok. River which would have given about 400,000 af of fresh water while providing flood and enviro protection for the delta at the same time constructing facilities no and so of the delta. That alt 9-10 years ago would have been the cheapest and least disruptive to a way of life in this Delta and would urge you very strongly as staff members to re-visit that issue because we don't know what happened to the digging out of the no fork project. and the need to add additional storage, with the increase of pop, ;and agr and env concerns in the state of CA, until you come up with more storage to met these needs and have an efficient delivery system or this so called delta problem won't go away. Speaking as a local person here, let's go back to digging out the so. Fork idea - and reach an enviro safe.

A- is spoken to in alt D

In terms in the Delta there are a lot of ways to approach the levees, maint etc. we have looked at how many levees meet the standards, and we only found 20. We would find the islands that need to be brought up to standard. Basically the whole Delta as a unique area and bringing the islands up to standard

Q - Lu Silva - Hydro Eng. Assoc in Walnut Creek - I know its early Haven't seen here and in other water quality meetings is an economic evaluation and analysis - , not short term, I'm talking about a life project or that kind of analysis that reflect in other words, I understand that you are taking some farm land out of production, and if that is the case before you make some significant decisions on some of these parameters you should grind in some of the economics. It wasn't in your diagrams and you have nothing on economics and it seems to me that is the lifeblood of Calif.

Q- Mike Jackson - (Pauline Davis) Plumas Co - We believe that the area of origin act the Delta Protection act and the Watershed of origin act means that they can only take surplus water. And we believe that the solution should be paid for by the urban water users who take out of the state water project because the state water project is essentially what broke the system. However, we're going to go through this circumstance We believe that alt A while very useful, should not be a stand alone and should be an aspect of all the other alts - the if demand can be reduced by 3 1/2 maf of water - we believe that out to happen first -

Support high level of channel capacity improvements here in the delta and very high level of water shed and habitat, and any activity that will support water quality for agr use in the delta and we understand that at some of the points where water quality is measured don't do as good of a job as they should and think that there should be some additional sampling points added.

We are interested in Alt - I - The only alt that indicates how much water you want from the north, (6-8maf) requires an isolated conveyance and the conveyance goes under the delta and

comes out on the westside. Who owns that facility, in the Sierras there are 2 huge facilities on either side of us and we can't touch the water. I understand that there are water districts down here that have water rights out of New Moloanes that have never been able to touch the water - it seems that Area of origin should have first take at the water and we want to own the facility. If there are any conveyance facilities built, we would desire that they are being built from the north to avoid water quality standards in the Delta that there be dual delivery systems built, it makes no sense to us to take water on the basis of the Sacramento River water quality and take it around the delta and then mingle it with the water the goes south in the canal. We don't think that it improves the water quality in any fashion and it just gives an excuse to get more water from the north of the delta.

Q -Sally Shanks - Staten island - need for regional flood control and the fact that we seem to be addressing flood control only from area of levee stabilization and those areas that talked in terms of improved channel capacity is what needs to be addressed in all the alts. If you have isolated facilities around the delta you still would not address the need for regional flood control. You have said Maintain channel capacity - what level, historically the channels were dredged - it's impossible to get through the permitting at this point the south fork is becoming a wonderful shallow habitat full of all the gov. Regulations on permitting to clear it and I don't see if you take the water around and have not a lease in your programmatic to allow us or to accommodate someone in improving channel capacity, we are still sunk in a flood control manner.

Q - John Winther - Focus on levee issue, we can see in SB 900 thought by many to be the funding vehicle for this process, which has a token amount for levee improvement, and that about 2-57 are below HMP standard and below standards only because of surfacing on the roads. HMP and is not a standard, HMP was a milestone that allowed us to get through a crisis in the Delta where we could be get some sense of comfort with flood insurance from FEMA. Maybe if you are on very strong mineral soil, HMP could be sufficient - but the idea of bringing the islands up to HMP is well below what requires any sense of stability. Notice that all the noticed that in all the isolated facilities, give some sense of comfort in the delta because you are giving extensive levee maint. and emergency flood response and in fact if you had an isolated facility who would particularly care to fund those sorts of things, I see its almost backwards, if you had an in-delta system that transported water from no to so, that's where I would see that the tax payers no and so would be willing to pay for levee stabilization and emergency response no and on the levee stabilization we see a token in SB 900l, we see almost a tokenism in this analysis and the idea of hmp, if you think hmp is protection of levees in the delta, you ought to join us with Curt Schmutte's group on the 29th, which is working hard on this issue on a group package.

L.S. - Concept of the Common Delta pool - concern is there and multi-faceted, what's the commitment, how do you guarantee today the facility will be operated the way it was intended to in 40 yrs. That is the essence of the common Delta Pool issue and want to assure you that we know about this and it has to be addressed - What is the range of cost?

range of modest to extensive -- 3/4b to 11/2b \$\$ - for funding of levee stab. Work.  
channel capacity - Mokelumne - many of the alts include channel capacity improvements, 1/4 - 1/2 b \$\$

Q - practical political do any of you think that the leg is going to come up with the \$\$.

Unless we can figure out a way to move forward, we all lose.- one sector can blow out any other sector - tie a commitment to funding.

Try to tell a congressman the difference between building a dam which they can see multi uses - enviro and agri and urban as opposed to fixing a levee that someone is going to tell him is going to fail - you people have been talking about collapsing and failing levees for the last 40 years, why should we put 1 ½ b\$\$ into this project.

q- buy out the feds - and let CA take care of itself

Q - Rick Belstrap - farmer in Escalon - to the casual observer, all alts rely heavily on reduced use, are heavy on environment and habitat restoration , and LA wants clean water and doesn't want it going through the delta, and want it brought it around the Delta from up stream, for the most part it comes at the agri/farmers expense - either by flooding islands, or putting westside out of business - not using farm ground. The biggest problems are- All these altr rely heavily on reduce demand, and I think that is flawed. As population increases, demand will be increasing cities always get the water first- people are at the top of the food chain and they need it first, and but it usually comes at the expense of AG - there are a few that list increased supply - always but always minimal, and that is the basic flaw with all these all these alts. in response to agr users. There seems to be in some ways, emphasis on levee maint is throwing the AG/farmers a bone, so they are bought off. The city people need food and we someone to sell it to. The world food supply is in ways we have never thought of before - threatened ie: Mad cow disease in Briton and the Carnal bundt fungus now major problem in CA and throughout the wheat growing areas. If we as a nation want to develop and maintain adequate and reliable food supply we have to have excess production always so we can have wheat to sale -wheat is trading at high levels because of a global grain shortage. Farmer needs to have some assurance of continued water rights and cannot be neglected and it seems that on every proposal is just taking it away from the farmer - as the population grows it is going to use more water, not less- flawed concept . There are some good proposals in all of them that can be extracted and put to good use, need to increase demand.

Q- Lance Johnson - Georgiana Slough project - worked for westlands water dist out of Fresno. - and we are very committed to solving the problems that exist. We feel it is absol mandatory that an thorough and detailed Economic analysis be done -report rec'd showed the range of cost of 4.1-12.9b\$\$ range - putting forth a grossly inaccurate picture of what actually would occur in the moderate demand management range by evidenced by the failure, thanks to the direct intention of the Fish & Wildlife Service & Bureau of Reclamation last year to execute transfer of 64,000 maf - The failure lead to 24000 acres of land fallowing, and I was asked what was the cost of this failure to transfer the water and fallowing of the land and I was presented a study done by UCD two years ago, we took the numbers from that study and came up with 200m\$\$ 1 year costs the bottom line is if you intend to retire or fallow anywhere from 400,000- 800,00 your 1 yr costs will be in the range of \$6-7billion and that doesn't include socio-economic impacts. So to put forth this 4.1-12.9 billion \$\$ range is doing a dis-service in not more accurately representing what will is going to occur. We will maintain that it mandatory that for

any document or analysis to be acceptable that it will be full, complete and detailed be very high, does not accurately represent costs, absolutely mandatory that the document be complete. And in process of preparing detailed written comments and recommendations for that - we very much like the levee stability aspects, and is very important to the entire state - channel improvements - we feel they are a deficit in that there is not sign. So of delta storage to take advantage of these once in awhile extra flows - calculations that we have done indicate that instead of  $\frac{1}{2}$  - 1 maf, the real world numbers is more like 2-3maf. We very much support a dem management component, its some of the work we did and fought very hard for to make sure that was in every alternative. We support habitat restoration and would like to see more in the way of toxics controls and beyond that we are still in the process of evaluating the information so far.

Q Tim Wilson -Levee districts and levee repairs- 1986 flood cost us 20-50m \$\$ so the channel capacity is important from that stand point and revisit your numbers to bring levees up to a moderate level which would be hmp or pl 99 standards -You mention a billion \$\$ - if we go out with a 1000m\$ and think number is wildly exaggerated and think from a political standpoint, would be the kiss of death for the through delta system, which most of us think is the way to go here. The dredging and restoring levees would just by definition create more habitat and far more levee stability. look and see if the numbers are too high.

Byron Buck - Urban CA - CUWA - urban are not looking for Calfed to solve all of Ca water supply problems, nor are we looking for called to solve all of the individual urban water agency water needs as urban agencies trying to met the largest portion of urban demand growing in CA But the delta is certainly part of the solution for increasing needs and the key issue for us is that the alts need to address access to high quality drinking waters for urban areas dependent on upon the supplies. Increasing numerous and more stringent water quality standards requires that the highest potential available source of water -reasonable available be available for urban agencies. A solution that assumes you can always treat to meet the standards is one that would not be durable and would not met your solution principles - we are finding with increased drinking water standards, mandated by the Federal govern. That we may not be able to stay ahead of the treatment curve and we need to have a higher quality source so that we can treat to meet the public health needs of the state. CUWA will be recommending three alternatives - which are bits and pieces of the ones you have presented. One alt - modified through delta facility- widening some of the northern delta channels - providing for additional habitat and additional cross -section flow, limited capacity isolated facility size and location not specified, determined for meeting public health needs and provided storage to (submitting in written form)-meet needs.

Citizens for ca drinking water, Ca Love Canal - we are strictly against most of the transfer of water in and around the delta- because once you do that the quality of the delta will deteriorate and has already impaired our fish most of the S.J. river is already impaired and have been promised water from other places(New Moloanes) - Penoche water dist down so has opened part 28 MILES of the San Luis Drain and are dumping waster water directly into Salt Slough that will be directly into our drinking water supply effecting our drinking quality - water is so polluted that we can't drinking hope that something comes out of this that will benefit not only the

farmers that keep complaining they don't have any water and the farmers have 75% of our water and what they give back is so polluted we can't hardly drink it. Something needs to be done with that issue - and now they are talking about 800,000 acres to pump out in the SJ Valley in the Chips Valley- the old sj drain again. You can't take 3-4maf out of Delta and bring 7-800,000 of sewage water and put it back in the Delta with so much selenium that we cant eat the fish and the ducks now.

Q- Agr water is not the biggest pollution source - urban water is our biggest pollution source. We need to be dredging channel- one thing that has to be done. What is the problem with it - what are the environ problems with dredging-- is it turbidity of water?, clean wtr standards, what? SF has bigger problem and they should be tertiary treating urban runoff and the same with Sacramento. Know in Sacramento Regional Sanitation Dist says costs will be 3-4 billion \$\$ to put in a tertiary treatment plant in. Bay better looking at themselves and they want water not just for drinking, but so they can flush the bay so they can meet epa standards- don't see that addressed in very much literature. Talk to reg water control board, and haven't found any pesticide residues in Piercson Dist and not many residues any where else are, but find it in Freeport area from urban population for one reason - when agr people spray it combines with clortal particles of the soil and fixes and only time runs off is when you wash the particles into the water and it floats out - in urban areas they spray it onto the lawn it washes off into the gutter and goes down the sewer and directly into the river. Dredging - is environmentally sound it adds more habitat and fish know how to swim away from turbidity in the water.

Steve Mello -Tyler Island , Rec'd the WS pkt 6 today - formally requesting that we have another public meeting in this area because he has not had enough time to read the information and process information and formulate a response.

1. Purchase of privately owned land by state or fed government and its retirement from the special tax basis of the special districts - such as: fire protection reclamation dist, school dist, and others that provide the services we Delta residents rely upon will put a burden on the remaining tax payers in order to provide the funding necessary to provide the same level of services
2. Retire agr land- from production would erode the economic base required by our farm support industry as well as other business that rely on farm support personnel, the loss of portions of our farm support industry would drive the cost of farming up for the Delta farming industry.
3. The screening of in-Delta water diversions which are pumps and siphons would be costly - costs should not be paid for by in-delta users and if those screens are installed there should be some way to by-pass them if they plugup which would render the siphons or pumps inoperative and the crop loses caused by non-operation of diversion facilities can be immediately costly and Farmers should be reimbursed for those loses if they do occur. Taking water around the Delta has the potential to devalue Delta lands by putting into question our riparian and contractual water rights. It also may detract from water quality and quantity currently available to use. In looking at the 20 alternatives it appears that the shaded riverine aquatic is being created precisely where the biologists are trying to anadramous fish from going. If water side berms are to be created, dredge boils from river channels adjacent to the proposed berms should be used so as not to reduce channel capacity which would further add to the problem of water seepage and flood

problems by raising water surface elevations. Hope to solve the water problems of the State without destroying the Delta as we know it.

Q- Question for man representing CUWA - the through Delta facility that they were going to study as one of their three alternatives - they didn't mention enlarging the southern channels of the delta is that true or did I miss here you? If you're going to use it as a viable alternative of study.

Richard Denton -Contra Costa Water Dist- alt d & e in the package - they don't' do exactly what we had in mind, the idea there was not necessarily enlarge the channels by deepening them which would or could have the effect of de-stabilizing the levees, the idea would be more to set the levees back which would give opportunity to re-engineer the levee and make it much stronger and at same time provide for additional habitat at the same time you are increasing conveyance. That process should occur in the North due to flood problems as well as need to protect habitat for the anadromous fish that are using the SAC River area and stray into the Delta - but also you need the increase of conveyance down in the so delta to make sure any water that you are moving through the Delta can get down to the So area as well.

Jim Shanks- Statton island - Meandering concept and restoring to the natural flows to the river - where would this meandering occur -( upper sac where not in the levee areas, - upstream - way up - Chico landing area building on the SB 1086 program that's been worked on for the last few years) We have property- north at Chico Creek is our northern boundary and have very serious problems at murphys slough entrance into Butte basin - hasn't been reinforced -and find out now the reason it hasn't been fortified is because you want to get back to this meandering concept and its going to meander through Colusa and Grimes - and everyone wants to talk about the natural flows of the river - I'd like you to take us on tour and show us the natural flow of the the river Sac - not any part of it natural anymore. - Nothing there that resembles anything that was natural - and its a very serious problems up there and the enviros that have nothing at risk, are jumping on this opportunity to describe this as a meandering belt and perhaps we should meander the river through Sutter's Fort and if that works - try it up stream.

A - you're saying we should be looking at concerns and how it effects land owners(meander belts)

Contra Costa Dist - 400,000 water users in Eastern and central Contra Costa Co- Delta is our only source of water -and we do serve water within the legal boundaries of the Delta. the get interesting improving water quality for customers and users, but also for meeting enviro needs for fish and wildlife, and for recreation. District has invested 450m \$\$ in construction of the Loston Carriage project which will provide us with good water for blending when the water quality in the Delta is not good and provide us with reliability when pollutants spill into the Delta we can use water from our reservoir. Any alt should look at Delta protection act and that is , that requires the cvp and swp to provide sufficient water quality and an adequate water supply. That is something that is already on the books and don't feel its been addressed in the past. Anything that gets done in the Delta or any add'l activities need to recognize those existing statues - area of origin upstream and Delta protection downstream in the Delta. Against large facilities that

has possibility to degrade the water quality and confuses the fish, by taking water to the so and release it- that is a problem and points out the major flaw with a large isolated facility, leave enough water in the delta to protect delta water quality and if you can't do it with a large isolated facility because you'll confuse the fish then you shouldn't do it at all. A through Delta facility will only work if you have significant reduction in pollutants. Understand the concerns of the agr water agency that any retirement of land should be done on the basis of improving water quality to reduce those impacts and not put the farmers out of business. - Everybody needs to do their bit in terms of Demand Management - Costs all of the beneficiaries should pay not just the urban agencies. Support Alt E that sets back levees , triple benefits of flood control, eco-habitat restor and conveyance increases.

A - On the large facility Is there a way we can operate and have it be a positive thing? -

Response - this exchange with different entities on the East side would be a way to get water into the Delta - or maybe buying up water in the S.J. would be a way of getting flows - but things are too tight on S.J. unless you release water from Friant - which a lot of people would like to see and unless you start doing that there isn't a lot of water left down there to get water from other sources like the S.J. so the only way you can do it is to share this water you're getting out of the Sacramento R. And putting it back somehow into the So Delta, but problem with the fisheries then it is something that won't be able to be done.

Jim McDonald - Pittsburgh -resident -- vague-- water quality end up costing and who benefits, and who will get hurt the most - even if the farmers do every thing to reduce water uses - eventually there will not be enough water for calif in any of these alternatives to satisfy everyone- heard of importing water from North of Sierra as far as Canada - concerned with water quality in Contra Costa Co. - we're building our own reservoir and will benefit So Cal because they're stealing our water and they are not paying their fair share -- the idea where they were going to dam to create to power just north of San Rafael-Richmond bridge, have to bring water level up 4 ft above the high tide - build dam -just high enough to stop salinity up the San Pablo Bay up to Delta - 100% fresh water - help with flushing lower part of bay - storing water at high tide. COE is doing study for power, but not for water

Sally shanks - Q - alt c - would that we expandable and would that be a dedicated water to municipalities only - if its put in a isolated facility on rationale of drinking water and would that be isolated for municipalities? (Would you like it to be?) Oh yes, I would feel terrible if you took water around the Delta to an isolated facility to grow crops to compete with us in the Delta. - delta habitat restoration -concerned with decline of aquatic habitat and waterside terrestrial habitat that is in advanced stage of deterioration. We've done a lot of work to blend levee maint with restoration or stopping the decline and have tried to stop it, and is impossible to get through the permitting. Consideration should be given if you're doing a programmatic EIR - should be able to come to grips to allow us to blend at the land/water interface on our levee practices then we wouldn't be faced with the choice of strip and rock - know we've moved into not even wanting to come in with water base repair equipment - simply barge in the truckloads of rock and roll them off the edge and be done with it - it doesn't require permits and we don't have to touch the water. That is what we are doing now and that is promoting further deterioration water site



habitat. We don't think that's our fault and if all these groups are working together than we should be able to include that. We don't want to have to mitigate to get these water-line repairs made - so we just strip and rock.

A- Gov permitting needs to be fixed  
habitat in the delta and\ the channel islands are systematically eroding away and it valuable habitat

Jim McCloud - Major problem that enviros tell us is eroding and the enviros tell us that we are doing a terrible job with what we are doing with fixing levees. The enviros never happy with anything we do and want everything back to like the Indians had it. People are not addressing this problem. We are not the problem and are trying to maintain this thing and like our habitat . Horrible management by f&g, fish and wildlife and nmpps - just look at Clifton Ct forebay where there is 80\$ creation and they refuse to do anything about it and blame the pumps for it. When catch fish in fish screens and catch them and truck them back to the water - they fix it so the predators eat the fish out of the trucks - they've been doing that for 30 years and still blaming it on the pumps and that's not right. Can't make them change it - NMPS has been allowing them to catch winter run salmon for years and years and blaming it on the pumps. So they coded/wired tagged the fish and never caught any in the pumps, but caught them out in the ocean. We have a major fish management problem and we are blaming the wrong people. If we are honest about it we might get this solved. We do like our habitat out here in the islands. We are being prevented from fixing the levees and being criticized for the levees and the habitats.

When the reg agency agrees that it is an unworkable solution to deal with the problems and why are they preventing us from fixing the levees,(why won't they let us fix the levees as we go along?) how can be change things without changing the laws and the attitudes - ulterior motive for the government come up with a big price tag and then they have to take over cause we are doing terrible job and we can get the job done and we're going to take it over from your guys. Do you know how to fix the problem of letting these guys fix the levees? (No)

A- No, not exactly but we know that having bigger government coming in and fix it doesn't do the job.

Sally Shanks - Corp of Eng planning section cannot get a permit from the other section and want to take farm land out of production and breach levees, to get around the permit problems. How will you maintain or regulate the recreational problems, boat wave, etc. that causes damage the habitat. Do we have the authority to regulate this actions?

C- there is some other alternative to get the salty water - the projects are importing over a million tons of salt a year into the valley and doing nothing to get rid of it.

Response?- Are you suggesting we should look at including a drain in an alternative?

Response - Absolutely - should be part of every alternative and several combinations of things can be used to get rid of the water - it doesn't all have to go out in the bay some of it could be evaporated, concentrated and dumped into the ocean, out in the bay during the high flows, and if

ponding arrangement could be made all that water could be sent out without degrading water quality in the Delta.

RQ -(Rick B) Do you see the iso. Fac. Where take water out much higher in Sac Riv where it is fresher and put into S.J. system so you reduce the overall salt load over the years as being a possible way to approach that?

Response - Yes, sounds like a good idea, but any where you take water out of the delta above or below is degrading water quality in the Delta and that is what everyone wants to do and no one wants to stop what they do. SF does it , EMUD - see that as a poor alternative.

Q- Part of all these alter should be to solve the (S.J.)so delta problem/drainage issue - has to be addressed..

Constructing drainage in all altr

q- Antioch /citizens for fresh drinking water - just found out that using sl drain to pump water into S.J. river, they've been using it by the Salt Slough and now they using the Mud Slough by using 28 miles of SL drain they also down in Fresno trying to get sl drain in operation again - are you in favor of it or against.

Response - L.S. - the primary way of dealing with drainage issue is retiring of hot lands in the S.J. and the other part is timing of flows so there are not the concentrations - main thrust we do not have a drain construction to the ocean or to the bay in any of these alternatives. And all of our alternative improve over the current situations.

Part of the problem is it coming in at the wrong time of the year during normal years and support some kind of completion of it through one of these alternatives - its getting into the river anyway by ponding it up and re-circulating it all we are doing is delaying what is eventually going to happen - we in the south Delta think the time is now and should be completed before any more exports go on in the valley- should be an integral part of the program, not a side-bar

Q-Alt C & G -both are conveyances at time the water is taken from iso facility above the Delta are the pumps going to be operating at full levels and have you calculated the amount of the water to be taken out if both the iso conveyance and the Delta pumps operating at the same time.

No we haven't -

Comment - Your alternatives say that facilities already permitted will be operating at full permit.

Steve - the pumps are limited by their capacity and if additional water to divert then they could divert - physical limitation to how much water can be pumped

Comment on last 8 yrs - go into schools promoting fishing - gives rods and reels; If the kids can't take the fish home and eat them, then we don't them to learn how to fish. And Don't eat the ducks, the kids respond to this problem and it breaks my heart that this program should go by the side and the contamination of our wildlife is too sad.

Is a portion of AG land retirement - exclusively related to drainage and controversial issue.